GOVERNMENT

OF

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

TUESDAY

MAY 3, 2005

+ + + + +

The Public Meeting convened in Room 220 South, 441 4th Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20001, pursuant to notice at 9:30 a.m., Geoffrey H. Griffis, Chairperson, presiding.

BOARD OF ZONING MEMBERS PRESENT:

GEOFFREY H. GRIFFIS Chairperson
RUTHANNE G. MILLER Vice-Chairperson
JOHN A. MANN, II Board Member (NCPC)

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBER PRESENT:

JOHN PARSONS Commissioner (NPS)

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

CLIFFORD MOY Deputy Secretary BEVERLEY BAILEY Zoning Specialist JOHN NYARKU Zoning Specialist

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL:

SHERRY GLAZER, ESQ.

This transcript constitutes the minutes from the Public Meeting held on May 3, 2005.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

I-N-D-E-X	2
	PAGE
PRELIMINARY MATTERS	3
APPLICATION NO. 17313 OF EDWARD ERTEL AND JENNIFER SOUIRES	4

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	10:41 a.m.
3	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good morning, ladies
4	and gentlemen, let me call to order the third of May,
5	2005, public meeting of the Board of Zoning Adjustment
6	for the District of Columbia. My name is Geoff
7	Griffis, Chairperson.
8	Joining me today is Ms. Miller, the Vice
9	Chair, and representing the National Capital Planning
10	Commission, with us is Mr. Mann. Mr. Etherly is not
11	with us this morning, as he is on scheduled travel and
12	there is no Zoning Commission Member with us this
13	morning, for the decision making.
14	Copies of today's agenda are available for
15	you. I'm going to skip right through this as we have
16	one case for decision making, and I think we should
17	get right to it.
18	Let me say good morning to Ms. Bailey and
19	also Mr. Moy, and ask Mr. Moy, is there any
20	preliminary matters for the Board's attention at this
21	time?
22	MR. MOY: No, sir, not this morning.
23	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good. Then why don't
24	we call the first case for the decision.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

MR. MOY: Yes, good morning, Mr. Chairman

24

and members of the Board. The case this morning is Application Number 17313 of Edward Ertel and Jennifer Squires, pursuant to 11 DCMR 3103.2, for a variance from the lot occupancy requirements under Section 403, 403, and a variance from the non-conforming or structure provisions under Subsection 2001.3, to allow an addition to a single-family, row dwelling in the R-4 District at premises 924 G Street, S.E. That's in Square 949, Lot 33. On April 26th, 2004, 2005, rather, the Board completed public

testimony on the application and scheduled its decision on May 3rd, 2005. The Board allowed the record to remain open to permit post-hearing documents.

The Applicant made their filing and it is in your case folders identified as Exhibit 27 and 28. Also, the staff notes for the Board, that the ANC-6B report, which is dated April 25th, 2005, was received by the Office of Zoning on the 27th of April, after the hearing date of April 26, and that's in your case folders identified as Exhibit 26.

And that will complete the Board's briefing, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay, thank you very much, Mr. Moy. Exhibit 26 is the ANC report, is that

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

5 1 correct, is that what you said? MR. MOY: Yes, sir. 2 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent. 3 And I 4 see any reason why we wouldn't waive 5 requirements for filing time on that and accept it into the record, unless there's any concern with that. 6 7 Let me through as Mr. Moy qo of course we did have the 8 indicated, additional filings which I thought were pertinent. 9 This was a 10 case that we looked at, not too long ago, 11 obviously it's been fresh and we've spent some time 12 reviewing it. I would note that we do have the Office of 13 14 Planning not in favor or recommending not to approve 15 this application. And obviously that always raises 16 some concern of the Board, or at least some attention to direction of elements that need to be addressed. 17 Clearly we've looked and strongly rely on 18 19 the Office of Planning's analysis of the 20 regulations and policy and how that fits into our it's one element and one aspect, and an important one, 21

of our decision making, in pulling together the full record on any Applicant's case.

To that, though, in my mind, looking at this, first of all, I'll set off that I believe that

22

23

24

there's a fairly persuasive case moving for approval.

And in limited deliberation to open up here, I think
there is an incredible amount of confluence of factors
that have created the uniqueness that has been
persuasively shown.

The practical difficulty, I think, is also there, but again is not, one might say, full. And so, why do I bring this up at this juncture? Well, obviously we're decision making.

But let me be direct. I believe that with the concerns of the Office of Planning that they're arising, first of all, out of the reliance on the historic nature of this.

But more importantly, in my mind, looking at the fact that this is going through the Historic Preservation Review, I believe that it would probably be administrative efficiency if we were to postpone decision on this, and have this go through Historic Preservation, to be reviewed.

My point being that this may, in fact, change. It may fundamentally change. And it may impact the zoning that's being asked for now. So rather than having an Applicant get, let's say hypothetically, get an approval today.

Move to HPRB, and it changes. And then

NEAL R. GROSS

coming back here. Let's keep this all in play and let's keep this running, and I think that is the most efficient way to do this.

That will also, conceivably, with any changes that take place, would allow for the other agencies, the ANC and the Office of Planning to address any changes that came forward.

I was particularly pleased with the last filing of the Applicant, and that is the restating of the tests, the uniqueness and practical difficulty and whether it would impair the integrity of the zone plan.

I also was particularly pleased with the photographs in establishing other conditions of lot configurations within Capitol Hill, and I would, I think I, well, I think that those are important documentations into the record on this case.

But let me open it up to others and, I guess, to be, to summarize what I would suggest at this point, for a quick decision, is that we postpone a decision to it time certain, and look to a positive outcome in design being brought back with Historic Preservation Review for our zoning analysis in the case. Others?

MEMBER MANN: I would just add that, I

1 think you said something about administrative efficiency? 2 3 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. MEMBER MANN: And, I mean it's not simply 4 5 for the Applicant's benefit, our administrative I mean I think this will work for the efficiency. 6 7 efficiency of the application as well. 8 It's not like we're just doing this to make it easier on ourselves. I think this could 9 10 potentially help the Applicant in this process. 11 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good, I absolutely 12 agree. 13 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yes, I'd also like to add that I think HPRB's input in this case 14 15 would make our record more complete and more full. 16 And my initial inclination on this case is that the factors are pretty strong for variance, but I 17 think we need a full case. I think the Applicant did 18 19 a good job supplementing the record after the hearing. 20 And I think that OP's concerns, respect to uniqueness and practical difficulty, were 21 based on an analysis of factors before Applicant 22 23 submitted it. And I think, and didn't contemplate case 24 25 law that may support this case. So, in any event, I

1 don't think this should be a sign and this Board has serious problems, necessarily, with the case, but that 2 3 it would be a more full and complete and strong case to look at, after HPRB. 4 5 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good. Okay, if that's the case then, I suggest that we set a date 6 7 certain that we will postpone our decision to. 8 would suggest that we do that the first Tuesday in September. 9 10 Mr. Moy, if you would save that date for 11 me? 12 MR. MOY: Yes, that date, the regular public meeting date is September the 13th, 2005. 13 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent, good. 14 15 two points to that. We will keep the record open, of 16 course, for any other additional filings from the 17 Applicant. We would suggest that the Applicant give 18 those, any filings, to the Office of Planning, and 19 20 also to the ANC. We could keep the record open for additional, supplemental filings, from 21 22 groups. Lastly, the 13th of September is when we 23 would bring this up again on our own accord. 24

was ready to go prior to that. HPRB approval comes

1 through next week, then we're ready to go at any time. So we would look to the Applicant to give 2 3 us any state that would be appropriate that they will be ready, of course, with the filing and all that. 4 5 I'm not adverse, at this point, knowing We don't meet in August, but I wouldn't our schedule. 6 be adverse if this was to be completed through HPRB in 7 8 June, to set a special public meeting in July, in order to expedite this. 9 10 So we can be very flexible in terms of our 11 schedule, in looking at this. This is, you know, it's 12 too bad in some respects, the small nature of this, 13 that it's taken so much time and energy to get around, 14 but I think that really speaks to how important we 15 take every single case. 16 But we also don't want to be cumbersome 17 for our schedules, Mr. Mann has said, and the Board 18 strongly feels for any Applicant's schedule. being said, I think that's what we should follow 19 20 through with today. 21 Let me also just state that, of course the 22 record - well, okay, there it is. Anything else, 23 then, Mr. Moy? No, Ι think that's, that 24 MR. MOY:

completes the agenda for the public meeting today.

1 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good, thank you. Thank you all very much. I hope that's clear what the 2 3 Board is trying to endeavor to do. And we'll look forward to seeing this, as soon as possible. 4 5 MR. ERTEL: (Speaking off microphone.) CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Oh, excellent, okay. 6 7 Coming out of the decision making, then, on 8 this case, just procedurally then, someone off the record here, but totally on it. You indicated that 9 10 it's May, you're set on the schedule to go to HPRB. 11 MR. ERTEL: (Speaking off microphone.) 12 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. And so that 13 could, conceivably, just Board members for our own 14 scheduling and understanding, we could conceivably 15 look at something in June/July. So, as I said, our schedule is flexible 16 17 for, right, right. For your needs in getting this done as quickly as possible. Work with staff in terms 18 of the schedule, because obviously if we get, if we 19 20 have new submissions and we're waiting for things to be submitted from Office of Planning or ANC, we're 21 22 going to have to schedule this, at least to give them a week, if not two weeks. 23 So, as soon as we hear something, let's 24 25 get this on the schedule and we'll keep moving on it.

1 MR. ERTEL: (Speaking off microphone.) CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Actually, why don't 2 3 you come up. Procedural questions, let's take, let's 4 just, no, I'm sorry, just have a seat. You just need 5 to be on the microphone, otherwise the transcript will show me talking to nobody. 6 7 MR. ERTEL: I apologize, talking to the 8 sky. What would we need to go back to the ANC for? If the design changed? 9 10 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes. I think for our 11 purposes, in terms of this, in terms of our hearing, 12 you need to provide the ANC with everything that's 13 being provided into the record here. 14 Now, if you talk, your judgement to go 15 present to the ANC or I think that would be well 16 I mean you have right now a recommendation of 17 the ANC that they support the application. So, if it fundamentally changes, you obviously want 18 19 continue their support. 20 MR. ERTEL: Oh, right, right, right. 21 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So I would just keep 22 them updated, I think, is the point of it. Let them 23 exactly what's happening, know and that way, hopefully, their support won't change. 24

MR. ERTEL: Right.

1 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Does that make sense? MR. ERTEL: Sure. 2 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: But in terms of our 3 requirements of, you know, filing and notice and all 4 5 that, that's been completed for this application. So we're not looking for any additional notification or 6 7 hearings or anything of that nature from the ANC realm. Yes. 8 9 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I just want to 10 comment that I think that we would be interested in 11 seeing, certainly, the HPRB decision, and then if 12 there was anything that the Applicant wanted to 13 submit, stating how that decision may or may not effect the variance application. 14 15 MR. ERTEL: Right, so if the HPRB changes 16 the design, I think I'd have to go back to the ANC and 17 then, obviously, show them the new design and what not. 18 19 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. 20 MR. ERTEL: Okay. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: And what Ms. Miller 21 22 is saying is, I think should be fully understood also 23 is the proceedings before HPRB, which are much more historically oriented, desian and how is that 24 25 impacting the zoning application as coming back before

1	us.
2	MR. ERTEL: Okay, I got you.
3	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.
4	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: And then they
5	would have a chance to respond.
6	MR. ERTEL: Right, right. Okay, I
7	got you.
8	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Thank you.
9	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Great. Okay, any
10	other procedural questions?
11	MR. ERTEL: No, I think I understand.
12	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good. And if not, as
13	I say, the staff at the Office of Zoning is excellent,
14	and they're totally up-to-date on the process of this
15	one.
16	So, they can answer any specific questions
17	you have in terms of scheduling or process of filings.
18	MR. ERTEL: I appreciate your time.
19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Great. No, we
20	appreciate yours. Okay, very well then, let's to move
21	to go ahead.
22	MR. ERTEL: Thank you very much.
23	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Thank you. If
24	there's nothing further then, Mr. Moy, why don't we
25	adjourn the public meeting of the 3 rd of May.

	15
1	(Whereupon, the proceedings in
2	the above-entitled matter were
3	concluded at 10:55 a.m.)
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	